Pharmacology, Biochemistry and Behavior 110 (2013) 245–248

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Pharmacology, Biochemistry and Behavior

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/pharmbiochembeh

Expression of behavioral sensitization to ethanol is increased by energy drink administration

Sionaldo Eduardo Ferreira [1], Karina Possa Abrahao [2], Maria Lucia Oliveira Souza-Formigoni *

Departamento de Psicobiologia, Escola Paulista de Medicina, Universidade Federal de São Paulo (UNIFESP), São Paulo, SP, Rua Botucatu 862 1º andar, CEP 04023-062, Brazil

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 4 November 2012
Received in revised form 10 July 2013
Accepted 24 July 2013
Available online 2 August 2013

Keywords:
Ethanol
Energy drink
Locomotor sensitization
Individual variability

ABSTRACT

Alcohol abuse and dependence are important medical, social and economical problems, affecting millions of people. A relatively recent habit among young people is mixing alcohol with energy drinks (ED), in spite of the risks involved may be higher than those associated with alcohol consumption alone. The mixture of alcohol and energy drinks, both with stimulant properties, may alter the perception of intoxication and could lead individuals to believe they are less drunk and can drink more or for longer periods of time. In animals, the repeated administration of ethanol can lead to a progressive increase of the locomotor stimulant effect, known as behavioral sensitization, a drug-dependent behavioral plasticity associated with vulnerability to addiction. As well as for addiction, there are clear individual differences in the level of sensitization to ethanol among species and even among individuals from the same strain. The present study assessed how ED affects the expression of ethanol sensitization. Female mice chronically treated with ethanol (2.4 g/kg) were classified as low-sensitized or high-sensitized. Two days later, different groups of mice were submitted to saline + water, ethanol + water or ethanol + ED systemic challenges. As expected, only the high-sensitized group expressed clear sensitization after ethanol administration. However, the administration of ethanol + ED triggered the sensitization expression in the low-sensitized group. These data indicate that the combined use of ED and ethanol can potentiate the stimulant and, consequently, the reward effects of ethanol in previously treated mice. If a similar process occurs in human beings, the use of ED can increase the risk of developing alcohol abuse or dependence.

1. Introduction

Considering that the harmful use of alcohol results in the death of 2.5 million people annually (WHO, Global status report on alcohol and health) many efforts and studies have been conducted in order to determine the factors which facilitate the transition from occasional use to abuse or dependence. Recently, there has been an increase in the combined consumption of alcohol and energy drinks (ED — such as Red Bull®, Flying Horse®, Burn® etc). These beverages contain caffeine and have been marketed as providing increased alertness (Miller, 2008; Reissig et al., 2009; Seifert et al., 2011). Some concerns on the combined use of alcoholic beverages and energy drinks (AED) have been expressed, since recent studies with college students suggest AED consumption increases the probability of binge drinking and dependence development (Marczinski, 2011). There are reports on the use of ED to reduce the depressant effects of ethanol and to extend the duration, or even to increase the intensity, of its stimulant effects (Ferreira et al., 2004a, 2004c). In a previous study, we showed ED significantly reduced the subjective sensations of alcoholic intoxication, although when objectively evaluated they did not reduce the harmful effects of alcohol on visual reaction time, motor coordination and physical performance (Ferreira et al., 2004b). Although some reports did not detect an association between the use of ED and alcohol dependence development (Verster et al., 2012), significant methodological differences must be taken into account. Arria et al. (2011) showed that ED consumption is associated with increased risk of development of alcohol addiction. Recently, other authors (Cheng et al., 2012; Marczinski et al., 2012, 2013) demonstrated that mixing energy drinks with alcohol may increase the motivation to drink and the vulnerability to develop alcohol dependence.

Ethanol reinforcing properties have been associated with the stimulation of the dopaminergic mesocorticolimbic pathway (Wise and Bozarth, 1987). The repeated exposure to drugs of abuse, such as ethanol, progressively increases their psychomotor stimulant effects, a phenomenon known as behavioral sensitization and considered a form of drug-dependent behavioral plasticity associated with addiction vulnerability (Masur and dos Santos, 1988; Masur et al., 1986; Segal and Mandell, 1974; Vanderschuren and Kalivas, 2000). Psychomotor or

* Corresponding author at: Departamento de Psicobiologia, Universidade Federal de São Paulo (UNIFESP), Rua Botucatu 862 1º andar, Sao Paulo, SP, 04023-062, Brazil. Tel.: +55 11 2149 0155; fax: +55 11 5572 5092.
E-mail address: mlosformigoni@unifesp.br (M.L.O. Souza-Formigoni).
[1] Present address: Departamento de Ciências do Movimento Humano, Campus Baixada Santista, Universidade Federal de São Paulo, Santos, SP, Brazil, Rua Silva Jardim, 136, 11015-020.
[2] Present address: Departamento de Farmacologia, Instituto de Ciências Biomédicas, Universidade de São Paulo (USP), São Paulo, SP, Brazil, Av. Prof. Lineu Prestes, 2415, 05508-900.

0091-3057/$ – see front matter © 2013 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pbb.2013.07.014

behavioral sensitization to ethanol has been suggested as a behavioral marker for alcohol preference and/or abuse liability in both animals (Grahame et al., 2000; Lessov et al., 2001) and humans (Newlin and Thomson, 1999). This suggests that those individuals whose develop sensitization may be more vulnerable to develop addiction. Besides, there are evidences that behavioral sensitization is associated with relapse in drug addiction (for review see Steketee and Kalivas, 2011).

It is important to note that not all animals from the same species and strain present stimulation after ethanol (Masur and dos Santos, 1988) or develop sensitization. In Swiss mice, it is possible to observe important individual variability in the development and expression of behavioral sensitization to ethanol (Souza-Formigoni et al., 1999). We have recently demonstrated that variations in the development of ethanol sensitization reflect individual differences in addiction vulnerability since ethanol sensitized mice voluntarily drink more ethanol than non-sensitized or saline-treated control mice (Abrahao et al., 2013). Despite the evidence of interaction between the stimulant effects of ethanol and ED, there are few studies on the behavioral effects of AED in animal models of the rewarding properties of drugs of abuse (Ferreira et al., 2004c). Considering that ED can increase the stimulant effect of ethanol, we hypothesized that ED administration could also increase the intensity of behavioral sensitization, as well as the proportion of mice that express it.

2. Methods

2.1. Animals

Albino Swiss female mice, from the Departamento de Psicobiologia-UNIFESP, 35–50 g, aged 75 days at the beginning of the experiment, were housed in plastic cages (44 × 34 × 16 cm, 18–22 animals/cage) with free access to Purina chow and water (lights on 07:00 a.m. and off 07:00 p.m., 22 ± 2 °C). The research project was approved by the Committee of Ethics in Research of UNIFESP (563/01). The procedures were carried out in accordance with international norms of the *Guide for the care and use of laboratory animals* (1996).

2.2. Behavioral sensitization protocol

In order to induce sensitization to the stimulant effects of ethanol, we adopted previously described procedures (Quadros et al., 2005; Souza-Formigoni et al., 1999). For the assessment of their baseline locomotor activity, all the animals were initially evaluated in one 15 min session in a drug free situation, in Opto-Varimex cages (Columbus Instruments, Columbus, Ohio; 47.5 × 25.7 × 20.5 cm), which detect locomotor activity by the interruption of horizontal photoelectric beams. From one day after the baseline test on, seventy six mice were daily treated i.p. with saline (n = 30) or 2.4 g/kg ethanol (n = 46, 15.0% p/v, Synth®) for 21 days and their activity was weekly evaluated for 15 min in locomotor activity cages (Opto-Varimex Mini, Columbus Instruments, Ohio), immediately after the drug administration. Based on their locomotion on day 21, ethanol-treated mice were classified into two groups: the lowest half was considered as low-sensitized and the highest half as high-sensitized. This classification was used to define two profiles of locomotor response after the ethanol chronic treatment, allowing us to evaluate possible factors associated with the individual variability.

2.3. Challenge phase

On day 23, the three subgroups (saline, low-sensitized and high-sensitized) were divided into three challenge groups. The groups were separated taking into account their levels of activity during the development of behavioral sensitization to ethanol, making sure there were no baseline differences among them before the challenges. Different subgroups of mice were challenged with saline i.p. + water p.o; ethanol i.p. + water p.o. or ethanol i.p. + ED p.o. The ED Red Bull® (Fuschl/Austria — commercially available) was administered in a dose equivalent to 3 cans (250 ml/can) for a 70 kg human being (10.71 ml/kg). It is important to point out that this dose contains 3.43 mg/kg of caffeine, an important stimulant constituent of Red Bull. After the administration of the drugs, the activity was evaluated for 15 min immediately after drug administrations.

2.4. Data analyses

The locomotor activity counts during the 15 min tests, weekly performed during the treatment, were analyzed by two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for repeated measures, being group (saline, low-sensitized and high-sensitized mice) the independent factor and time (the days of tests) the repeated measure factor. The data from the challenge phase were also analyzed by a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with group (saline, low-sensitized and high-sensitized mice) and challenge (saline + water, ethanol + water or ethanol + ED) as independent factors. The Newman–Keuls tests for multiple comparisons were used for *post-hoc* analyses.

In order to evaluate whether ED administration would change the proportion of stimulated mice, we computed the number of stimulated mice in each challenge test. We considered "stimulated" those whose locomotor activity levels were above the 95% upper limit of the confidence interval of the high-sensitized group levels on the ethanol + water challenge. In the saline + saline challenge no mice were considered stimulated according to this criterion. The statistical comparison of proportions was made using the test of proportions.

The level of significance adopted was 5% for all analyses. We used the Statistica® v9.0 software for all analyses.

3. Results

Regarding the development of behavioral sensitization phase, the ANOVA, considering the factors group (saline, low-sensitized and high-sensitized) and time of treatment (days 1, 7, 14, 21) detected significant effects of group ($F_{2,73} = 64.28$, $P < 0.001$), time ($F_{3,219} = 106.53$, $P < 0.001$) and their interaction ($F_{6,219} = 41.87$, $P < 0.001$) (Fig. 1A). High-sensitized mice presented higher locomotor activity levels than the other groups on days 14 and 21 ($P < 0.05$) and higher locomotion on day 21 than on days 1 and 7 ($P < 0.05$), demonstrating the development of behavioral sensitization to the stimulant effect of ethanol (Fig. 1A).

The challenge phase of the experiment was performed in order to compare saline, low-sensitized and high-sensitized mice locomotor stimulation after ethanol or the combined administration of ED and ethanol. No differences among groups were found under saline + water challenge ($F_{2,21} = 0.82$). As expected, in the ethanol + water challenge ($F_{2,23} = 6.33$, $P < 0.05$), only the high-sensitized group presented higher activity levels than controls, demonstrating the expression of behavioral sensitization only in those mice that had developed high levels of sensitization to ethanol. However, when the mice received ethanol + ED ($F_{2,23} = 10.90$, $P < 0.05$), higher activity levels were observed both in the low and in the high sensitized groups when compared to saline pre-treated control mice (Fig. 1B).

Using the criteria of stimulation effect described in Section 2.4, we analyzed the percentage of mice considered stimulated after drug administration. From the high-sensitized group, 87.5% of the mice were considered stimulated after ethanol + water challenge (expression of behavioral sensitization), but after ethanol + ED the percentage of stimulated mice reached the total sample (100%, $P = 0.06$). Considering the low-sensitized mice, there were only 25% stimulated mice in the ethanol + water challenge, but the administration of ethanol + ED induced stimulation in 75% of the low-sensitized mice ($P < 0.01$) (Fig. 1C).

4. Discussion

Confirming our hypothesis, the administration of ethanol associated with ED significantly increased the intensity of behavioral sensitization expression and the proportion of "stimulated" mice. It is worth stressing that the administration of energy drink increased the locomotion of animals classified as low sensitized to ethanol, leading them to similar levels of stimulation as those observed in the highly sensitized. These data indicate that the acute administration of ED combined with ethanol increases the expression of behavioral sensitization to the stimulant effect of ethanol.

Some authors have proposed that sensitization to drugs of abuse can be used as an indirect measure of the neural adaptations related to the transition from controlled or occasional to compulsive drug use and addiction (Robinson and Berridge, 1993; Vanderschuren et al., 1999). There are similarities between sensitization and the reinstatement of drug use, since they share the same neural circuitry and some neurochemical changes induced by drug administration (Steketee and Kalivas, 2011). In previous studies, we have also demonstrated that sensitization is not observed in all ethanol-treated animals (Abrahao et al., 2009; Quadros et al., 2005; Souza-Formigoni et al., 1999). The individual variability in this behavioral response to drugs of abuse may be an important characteristic to be considered in the studies of neuroadaptation associated with chronic exposure to drugs. Besides, we have recently demonstrated that variations in the development of ethanol sensitization reflect individual differences in addiction vulnerability since ethanol sensitized mice voluntarily drink more ethanol than non-sensitized or saline-treated control mice (Abrahao et al., 2013).

ED are a mixture of caffeine, taurine, carbohydrates and vitamins of the B complex. Some studies in the literature suggest that caffeine and taurine might alter the physiological and behavioral effects of ethanol (Aragon and Amit, 1993; Aragon et al., 1992; Azcona et al., 1995; Mackay et al., 2002; Miquel et al., 1999; Nuotto et al., 1982; Quertemont et al., 2003). Caffeine effects on locomotor activity have been studied for a long time. Hilakivi et al. (1989) reported that caffeine doses up to 30 mg/kg did not change the locomotor activity of Swiss male mice while 60 mg/kg induced a depressant effect. The same authors found no interactions between the acute administration of ethanol (2.0 g/kg) and caffeine (up to 30 mg/kg) (Hilakivi et al., 1989).

The pretreatment with stimulant drugs is able to enhance the expression of behavioral sensitization to ethanol. Cocaine chronic treatment induces a clear behavioral sensitization and also cross-sensitization to an acute administration of ethanol (Lessov and Phillips, 2003). Besides, nicotine pretreatment significantly enhanced the ethanol-induced locomotor stimulation (Johnson et al., 1995). In the present study, we did not find an important acute effect of the co-administration of ethanol and ED in those mice that received a chronic treatment with saline. We showed that previous chronic treatment with ethanol may induce some neuroadaptations which are not associated with the development of high levels of sensitization to ethanol (low-sensitized group). However, after an acute administration of ED, it was possible to observe the expression of high levels of locomotor activity after ethanol administration in the low-sensitized group of mice.

This paper is the first demonstration of the increase in the expression of sensitization to ethanol after ED administration. It is important to consider that ethanol and the components of the ED, for example caffeine (for review see Butler and Prendergast, 2012), have overlapping neuropharmacology mechanisms. In vivo data suggest changes in the sensibility of adenosinergic A2A receptors (mainly target of caffeine) which become desensitized with prolonged ethanol exposure (Nagy et al., 1989). Besides, caffeine reduces hypnotic effects of alcohol



Fig. 1. A. Locomotor activity (means ± S.E.M.) in the tests performed on days 1, 7, 14 and 21, evaluated for 15 min on each test, of mice treated with saline or 2.4 g/kg ethanol. Based on the order of the activity levels on the last test day, ethanol-treated mice were classified into two groups: the lowest half was considered "low-sensitized" and the highest half "high-sensitized". * higher than the saline and the low-sensitized groups in the same test ($P < 0.05$) and than their own levels on test 1 ($P < 0.05$). B. Locomotor activity (means + S.E.M.) of the saline, low-sensitized and high-sensitized groups in the challenges: saline + water; ethanol + water or ethanol + ED, evaluated for 15 min on each test. # significantly higher than the saline group in the same challenge ($P < 0.05$). C. The graph represents the change in the proportion of stimulated mice in each subgroup (saline, low-sensitized and high-sensitized). We considered "stimulated" those mice whose locomotor activity levels were above the 95% upper limit of the confidence interval of the high-sensitized group levels on the ethanol + water challenge. In the saline + saline challenge, no mice were considered stimulated according to this criterion. Regarding the low-sensitized mice, there were only 25% stimulated mice in the ethanol + water challenge, but the administration of ethanol + ED induced stimulation in 75% of the low-sensitized mice (black line — $P < 0.01$). From the high-sensitized group, 87.5% of the mice were considered stimulated after ethanol + water challenge (expression of behavioral sensitization), but after ethanol + ED the percentage of stimulated mice reached the total sample (100%, $P = 0.06$).

through adenosine A2A receptor blockade (El Yacoubi et al., 2003) and A2A receptor deficiency leads to an increased sensitivity to the locomotor-stimulant effects of ethanol (Houchi et al., 2008). Thus, ED may enhance the stimulant effect of ethanol by the effect of caffeine in block adenosinergic receptors. We may hypothesize that low sensitized mice have higher levels of adenosinergic receptor that could mask the stimulant effect of ethanol. However, after ED administration and the effect of the caffeine on the adenosinergic receptors, ethanol is able to induce the high stimulant effect observed in the low-sensitized group. It is important to point out that other components of ED may also affect the stimulant effect of ethanol in low-sensitized mice.

Considering that the psychostimulant effect of drugs may be associated with its reinforcement properties (Wise and Bozarth, 1987), the data of the present study indicate that the combined administration of ethanol and ED may trigger rewarding effects in mice that were not stimulated by ethanol alone. Our data can be of clinical relevance, since if a similar phenomenon occurs in humans, one will be able to observe an increase in the number of individuals who experience the stimulant (reinforcing) effects of alcohol. This could lead to an increase in the odds of developing an abusive use of and/or dependence on this drug.

5. Conclusion

In the present study, the administration of ethanol alone or ED combined with ethanol induced an increase of the locomotor activity in mice that had developed clear levels of behavioral sensitization to the stimulant effect of ethanol. On the other hand, despite the administration of ethanol alone had not induced a clear locomotor stimulation in some mice (low sensitized group) the addition of ED to the same protocol caused a clear stimulant effect unmasking the expression of behavioral sensitization.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Marilde Costa and Dr. Isabel Marian Hartmann de Quadros for the technical support and Maria Helena Pagdi for the language revision. This work was supported by the Associação Fundo de Incentivo à Pesquisa (AFIP), the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) and the Fundação de Amparo a Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP 02/04191-0).

References

Abrahao KP, Quadros IM, Souza-Formigoni ML. Individual differences to repeated ethanol administration may predict locomotor response to other drugs, and vice versa. Behav Brain Res 2009;197:404–10.
Abrahao KP, Ariwodola OJ, Butler TR, Rau AR, Skelly MJ, Carter E, et al. Locomotor sensitization to ethanol impairs NMDA receptor-dependent synaptic plasticity in the nucleus accumbens and increases ethanol self-administration. J Neurosci 2013;33:4834–42.
Aragon CM, Amit Z. Taurine and ethanol-induced conditioned taste aversion. Pharmacol Biochem Behav 1993;44:263–6.
Aragon CM, Trudeau LE, Amit Z. Effect of taurine on ethanol-induced changes in open-field locomotor activity. Psychopharmacology (Berl) 1992;107:337–40.
Arria AM, Caldeira KM, Kasperski SJ, Vincent KB, Griffiths RR, O'Grady KE. Energy drink consumption and increased risk for alcohol dependence. Alcohol Clin Exp Res 2011;35:365–75.
Azcona O, Barbanoj MJ, Torrent J, Jane F. Evaluation of the central effects of alcohol and caffeine interaction. Br J Clin Pharmacol 1995;40:393–400.
Butler TR, Prendergast MA. Neuroadaptations in adenosine receptor signaling following long-term ethanol exposure and withdrawal. Alcohol Clin Exp Res 2012;36:4–13.
Cheng WJ, Cheng Y, Huang MC, Chen CJ. Alcohol dependence, consumption of alcoholic energy drinks and associated work characteristics in the Taiwan working population. Alcohol Alcohol 2012;47:372–9.
El Yacoubi M, Ledent C, Parmentier M, Costentin J, Vaugeois JM. Caffeine reduces hypnotic effects of alcohol through adenosine A2A receptor blockade. Neuropharmacology 2003;45:977–85.
Ferreira SE, de Mello MT, Formigoni ML. Can energy drinks affect the effects of alcoholic beverages? A study with users. Rev Assoc Med Bras 2004a;50:48–51.
Ferreira SE, de Mello MT, Rossi MV, Souza-Formigoni ML. Does an energy drink modify the effects of alcohol in a maximal effort test? Alcohol Clin Exp Res 2004b;28:1408–12.
Ferreira SE, Hartmann Quadros IM, Trindade AA, Takahashi S, Koyama RG, Souza-Formigoni ML. Can energy drinks reduce the depressor effect of ethanol? An experimental study in mice. Physiol Behav 2004c;82:841–7.
Grahame NJ, Rodd-Henricks K, Li TK, Lumeng L. Ethanol locomotor sensitization, but not tolerance correlates with selection for alcohol preference in high- and low-alcohol preferring mice. Psychopharmacology (Berl) 2000;151:252–60.
Hilakivi LA, Durcan MJ, Lister RG. Effects of caffeine on social behavior, exploration and locomotor activity: interactions with ethanol. Life Sci 1989;44:543–53.
Houchi H, Warnault V, Barbier E, Dubois C, Pierrefiche O, Ledent C, et al. Involvement of A2A receptors in anxiolytic, locomotor and motivational properties of ethanol in mice. Genes Brain Behav 2008;7:887–98.
Johnson DH, Blomqvist O, Engel JA, Soderpalm B. Subchronic intermittent nicotine treatment enhances ethanol-induced locomotor stimulation and dopamine turnover in mice. Behav Pharmacol 1995;6:203–7.
Lessov CN, Phillips TJ. Cross-sensitization between the locomotor stimulant effects of ethanol and those of morphine and cocaine in mice. Alcohol Clin Exp Res 2003;27:616–27.
Lessov CN, Palmer AA, Quick EA, Phillips TJ. Voluntary ethanol drinking in C57BL/6J and DBA/2J mice before and after sensitization to the locomotor stimulant effects of ethanol. Psychopharmacology (Berl) 2001;155:91–9.
Mackay M, Tiplady B, Scholey AB. Interactions between alcohol and caffeine in relation to psychomotor speed and accuracy. Hum Psychopharmacol 2002;17:151–6.
Marczinski CA. Alcohol mixed with energy drinks: consumption patterns and motivations for use in U.S. college students. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2011;8:3232–45.
Marczinski CA, Fillmore MT, Henges AL, Ramsey MA, Young CR. Effects of energy drinks mixed with alcohol on information processing, motor coordination and subjective reports of intoxication. Exp Clin Psychopharmacol 2012;20:129–38.
Marczinski CA, Fillmore MT, Henges AL, Ramsey MA, Young CR. Mixing an energy drink with an alcoholic beverage increases motivation for more alcohol in college students. Alcohol Clin Exp Res 2013;37:276–83.
Masur J, dos Santos HM. Response variability of ethanol-induced locomotor activation in mice. Psychopharmacology (Berl) 1988;96:547–50.
Masur J, Oliveira de Souza ML, Zwicker AP. The excitatory effect of ethanol: absence in rats, no tolerance and increased sensitivity in mice. Pharmacol Biochem Behav 1986;24:1225–8.
Miller KE. Energy drinks, race, and problem behaviors among college students. J Adolesc Health 2008;43:490–7.
Miquel M, Correa M, Sanchis-Segura C, Aragon CM. The ethanol-induced open-field activity in rodents treated with isethionic acid, a central metabolite of taurine. Life Sci 1999;64:1613–21.
Nagy LE, Diamond I, Collier K, Lopez L, Ullman B, Gordon AS. Adenosine is required for ethanol-induced heterologous desensitization. Mol Pharmacol 1989;36:744–8.
Newlin DB, Thomson JB. Chronic tolerance and sensitization to alcohol in sons of alcoholics: II. Replication and reanalysis. Exp Clin Psychopharmacol 1999;7:234–43.
Nuotto E, Mattila MJ, Seppala T, Konno K. Coffee and caffeine and alcohol effects on psychomotor function. Clin Pharmacol Ther 1982;31:68–76.
Quadros IM, Nobrega JN, Hipolide DC, Souza-Formigoni ML. Increased brain dopamine D4-like binding after chronic ethanol is not associated with behavioral sensitization in mice. Alcohol 2005;37:99–104.
Quertemont E, Devitgh A, De Witte P. Systemic osmotic manipulations modulate ethanol-induced taurine release: a brain microdialysis study. Alcohol 2003;29:11–9.
Reissig CJ, Strain EC, Griffiths RR. Caffeinated energy drinks — a growing problem. Drug Alcohol Depend 2009;99:1–10.
Robinson TE, Berridge KC. The neural basis of drug craving: an incentive-sensitization theory of addiction. Brain Res Brain Res Rev 1993;18:247–91.
Segal DS, Mandell AJ. Long-term administration of d-amphetamine: progressive augmentation of motor activity and stereotypy. Pharmacol Biochem Behav 1974;2:249–55.
Seifert SM, Schaechter JL, Hershorin ER, Lipshultz SE. Health effects of energy drinks on children, adolescents, and young adults. Pediatrics 2011;127:511–28.
Souza-Formigoni ML, De Lucca EM, Hipolide DC, Enns SC, Oliveira MG, Nobrega JN. Sensitization to ethanol's stimulant effect is associated with region-specific increases in brain D2 receptor binding. Psychopharmacology (Berl) 1999;146:262–7.
Steketee JD, Kalivas PW. Drug wanting: behavioral sensitization and relapse to drug-seeking behavior. Pharmacol Rev 2011;63:348–65.
Vanderschuren LJ, Kalivas PW. Alterations in dopaminergic and glutamatergic transmission in the induction and expression of behavioral sensitization: a critical review of preclinical studies. Psychopharmacology (Berl) 2000;151:99–120.
Vanderschuren LJ, Schoffelmeer AN, Mulder AH, De Vries TJ. Dopaminergic mechanisms mediating the long-term expression of locomotor sensitization following pre-exposure to morphine or amphetamine. Psychopharmacology (Berl) 1999;143:244–53.
Verster JC, Aufricht C, Alford C. Energy drinks mixed with alcohol: misconceptions, myths, and facts. Int J Gen Med 2012;5:187–98.
Wise RA, Bozarth MA. A psychomotor stimulant theory of addiction. Psychol Rev 1987;94:469–92.